



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

21
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,974	01/06/2000	Lee Evan Nakamura	ST9-99-111	2447

24033 7590 11/03/2004

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/478,974

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA, LEE EVAN

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 05/18/2004 to the original application filed 01/06/2000.
2. Claims 1-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended by Applicant. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Malamud et al.** (U.S. 6,437,800 – filed 10/1994) in view of **Zamora-McKelvy et al.** (U.S. 6,519,616 - filed 12/1999).

As to independent claim 1, Malamud teaches a method for displaying data on a display monitor under control of a computer (*Abstract*), comprising:

- displaying in a page a first portion of the field of data (*col.1, lines 38-42*) and a graphical element indicating that there is a second portion of the field of data within a display area (*col.2, lines 6-12*); and

- enabling the page to selectively present the first and second portions of the field of data in response to user input passing over the graphical element (*col.1, lines 58-64 and col.5, lines 30-39*).

Malamud, however, does not explicitly teach:

- retrieving one or more records matching a search criteria, wherein each record includes at least one field of data; and

- when a field of data includes a separator indicating that there are multiple values for the field

Zamora-McKelvy teaches:

- retrieving one or more records matching a search criteria (*col.2, lines 30-40 / col.3, lines 20-31*), wherein each record includes at least one field of data (*col.4, lines 59-65 and Fig.5*); and

- when a field of data includes a separator indicating that there are multiple values for the field (*col.3, lines 40-55 and Fig.3*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Zamora-McKelvy in the system of Malamud because it would have provided the capability for specifying the results of periodic tests of the live web site service that the user wants to view by submitting criteria for use in searching of a database having records.

As to dependent claim 2, Malamud teaches the presenting the first and second portions of the field of data comprises displaying the first and second portions in response to the user input (*col.1, lines 58-64/ col.5, lines 30-39 and col.6, lines 62-67*).

As to dependent claim 4, Malamud teaches selectively present the first and second portions of the field of data in response to user input (*col.1, lines 58-64 / col.5, lines 30-39 and col.6, lines 62-67*).

Malamud does not teach explicitly “the page is an HTML”

Zamora-McKelvy the page is an HTM (*e.g., web site; Abstract*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Zamora-McKelvy in the system of Malamud because it would have provided the capability for user(s) to easily access and view data records generated during periodic tests of the web site.

As to dependent claim 5, Malamud teaches displaying in the display area for each record the at least first portion of the field of data from each accessed data record (*col.1, lines 38-42*), wherein the page is enable to selectively present the first and second portion of the filed for the record in response to user input (*col.1, lines 58-64 and col.5, lines 30-39*), but does not explicitly teach “receiving a user request including the search criteria; and querying a database on the search criteria to access data records satisfying the search criteria, wherein there is a display area for each record.”

Note the discussion of claim 1 above for “receiving a user request including the search criteria; and querying a database on the search criteria to access data records satisfying the search criteria, wherein there is a display area for each record.”

As to dependent claim 6, Malamud teaches displaying the first portion in the display area comprises displaying a first value in the data field, and wherein presenting the first and

second portions in response to user input comprise displaying all the values from the data field
(*col.1, lines 58-64 / col.5, lines 30-39 and col.6, lines 62-67*).

As to dependent claim 7, Malamud teaches displaying at least one additional field of data in each display area for each accessed record (*col.4, lines 18-32*).

As to dependent claim 8, Malamud teaches the first and second portions are presented in response to user input indicating movement of a graphical pointer over the displayed graphical element (*col.1, lines 58-64 / col.5, lines 30-39 and col.6, lines 62-67*).

As to independent claim 9, it is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 10 & 12-16, they include the same limitations as in claims 2 & 4-8, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 17, it is directed to an article of manufacture for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 18 & 20-24, they include the same limitations as in claims 2 & 4-8, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

4. Claims 3, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Malamud et al.** in view of **Zamora-McKelvy et al.** as applied to claims 1, 9 and 17 above and further in view of **Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA)**.

As to dependent claims 3, 11 and 19, the combination of Malamud and Zamora-McKelvy does not explicitly teach “hover text”.

APA discloses hover text (*use of hover text is display the entire content in a display area ...to display all the content; specification, page 1*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of APA in the system of Malamud as modified by Zamora-McKelvy because it would have provided the capability for efficiently displaying data on a limited size of a displaying area.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 05/18/2004 have been fully considered, but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hoeber et al.	U.S Patent No. 5,157,768	issued: Oct. 20, 1992
Nicol et al.	U.S Patent No. 5,287,448	issued: Feb. 15, 1994
Martinez	U.S Patent No. 5,546,521	issued: Aug. 13, 1996
Martinez	U.S Patent No. 5,923,325	issued: Jul. 13, 1999

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
October 29, 2004


SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER